UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,887	08/14/2006	Sang Hyun Lee	2913714300	8072
30827 7590 04/16/2009 MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 1900 K STREET, NW			EXAMINER	
			KWON, ASHLEY M	
WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Comment	10/565,887	LEE ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	ASHLEY KWON	4111					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
	-· action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		secution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E							
closed in accordance with the practice under z	x parte Quayre, 1999 O.D. 11, 40	0.0.210.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav	vn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.	·						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement						
	nochon roquironnoni.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	• , ,	• •					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		, ,					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 LLS C & 110(a)	(d) or (f)					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 0.5.6. § 119(a)	-(d) 01 (1).					
·— <u> </u>	a baya baan maasiyad						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents		an Na					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	• •						
_ ·	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	d.					
A							
Attachment(s)	o□	(DTO 140)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)	(PTO-413) ite					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)						

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-7, drawn to a membrane electrode assembly.

Group II, claim(s) 8-15, drawn to a method for producing a membrane-electrode assembly.

Group III, claim 16, drawn to another membrane electrode assembly.

The inventions listed as Groups I - III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: In the instant case, Groups I and II lack unity of invention because their common feature does not provide a contribution over prior art. According to the search report, the invention of claims 1-15 is a hybrid membrane-electrode assembly with minimal interfacial resistance and preparation method by using the catalytic ink. This feature does not differentiate the invention of the prior art, US 5,415,888. US 5,415,888 discloses a method of making membrane and electrode structure having excellent characteristics that is formed by bonding the electrode to the membrane by a printing process using an ink comprising catalytically active particles.

Regarding the inventions listed as Groups I and III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: In the instant case, Groups I and III share a common inventive concept: the membrane electrode assembly comprising a catalyst. However, they do not share any common features that define it over the prior art.

A telephone call was made to Mark Kresloff on 4/6/09 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ASHLEY KWON whose telephone number is (571)270-

Application/Control Number: 10/565,887 Page 5

Art Unit: 4111

7865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30 - 5pm EST with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on (571) 272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AK

/PATRICK RYAN/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795